United Nations A/C.5/71/SR.23

General Assembly
Seventy-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
23 January 2017

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 23rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 23 December 2016, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Ms. King (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines)
Chair of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Ruiz Massieu

Contents

Agenda item 132: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors (*continued*)

Agenda item 137: Pattern of conferences (*continued*)

Agenda item 139: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 141: United Nations common system (*continued*)

Agenda item 142: United Nations pension system (*continued*)

Agenda item 145: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 146: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*)

Agenda item 147: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*)

Agenda item 148: Financing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

16-22978 (E)

Please recycle

Agenda item 149: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Agenda item 152: Financing of the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (*continued*)

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017

Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

Agenda item 133: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2018-2019 (*continued*)

Questions deferred for future consideration

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the main part of the seventy-first session of the General Assembly

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Agenda item 132: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.7)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.7: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors

1. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.7 was adopted.*

Agenda item 137: Pattern of conferences (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.12)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.12: Pattern of conferences

2. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.12 was adopted.*

Agenda item 139: Human resources management (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.11)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.11: Human resources management

3. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.11 was adopted.*

Agenda item 141: United Nations common system (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.15)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.15: United Nations common system

4. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.15 was adopted.*

Agenda item 142: United Nations pension system (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.6)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.6: United Nations pension system

5. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.6 was adopted.*

Agenda item 145: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.13)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.13: Administration of justice at the United Nations

6. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.13 was adopted.*

Agenda item 146: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.10)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.10: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

7. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.10 was adopted.*

Agenda item 147: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.8)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.8: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

8. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.8 was adopted.*

Agenda item 148: Financing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.9)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.9: Financing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

9. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.9 was adopted.*

Agenda item 149: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.14)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.14: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations

10. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.14 was adopted.*

Agenda item 152: Financing of the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.18: Financing of the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire

11. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.18 was adopted.*

Agenda item 134: Programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 (A/C.5/71/L.16)

Draft decision A/C.5/71/L.16: Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017

12. *Draft decision A/C.5/71/L.16 was adopted.*

Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2016 2017 (A/C.5/71/L.19)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.19: Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017

13. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 23 of section IV of draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.19 should be deleted. In section XIX, a new paragraph 29 bis should be inserted, to read: "Takes note of paragraph 20 of the report of the Advisory Committee".

14. **Mr. Tiare** (Burkina Faso), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, proposed that, in section XV of the draft resolution, a new paragraph 2 bis should be inserted, to read: "Decides not to allocate the budgetary resources for the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 32/2, on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity."

15. **Mr. García Moritán** (Argentina), speaking also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Mexico and Uruguay, said that the proposed oral amendment would seriously affect the work of the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, who been appointed in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 32/2. The Member States, including representatives of the regional groups, had rejected attempts in the Third Committee and the plenary General Assembly to postpone the adoption of measures related to resolution 32/2 and had recognized the integrity and independence of the Council. The Fifth Committee, as the administrative and budgetary body of the General Assembly, was not the appropriate forum for substantive discussion related to decisions taken by other United Nations bodies. A vote on the revised estimates for the Council would be unprecedented and ran counter to the principle that the Committee should approve adequate resources to ensure the full implementation of mandated programmes and activities. Resolution 32/2 had been approved by the Council and expressly confirmed by the Third Committee and the plenary General Assembly. In their capacity as the sponsors of Council resolution 32/2, the delegations for which he spoke requested a recorded vote on the proposed oral amendment. They would vote against the amendment because of its implications for the integrity and independence of the budget process and the system for the protection and promotion of human rights.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

16. **Ms. Medina** (Norway) said that her delegation would vote against the proposed oral amendment. The Committee's role was to decide on the administrative and budgetary questions of the Organization. The mandates adopted by the Human Rights Council should be funded and her delegation supported the draft resolution.

17. **Ms. Coleman** (United States of America) said that her delegation would vote against the proposed oral amendment. It was committed to the Independent Expert, whose appointment would improve the living conditions and safety of hundreds of thousands of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons around the world. The Human Rights Council had acted well within its authority in establishing the

mandate, attempts to reopen discussion of which had been rejected by the plenary General Assembly. Some delegations, however, were seeking to hinder the implementation of the mandate. Given that the Council had established special procedures on many previous occasions and the Independent Expert had already assumed his functions, the United States objected to further discussion of the matter, which would undermine the working methods of the United Nations. Her delegation appreciated the implementation of the mandate by the Independent Expert and looked forward to his contributions in the near future.

18. **Mr. Kantor** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Committee was not the appropriate forum for substantive discussion related to decisions taken by other United Nations bodies. A vote on the revised estimates for the Human Rights Council would be unprecedented. The Council had adopted resolution 32/2 in accordance with its mandate and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Consensus-based decision-making was a long-standing working practice of the Committee, and it was regrettable that a specific resolution and mandate of the Council had been singled out. The proposed oral amendment was based on political rather than technical or budgetary considerations. The introduction of political elements into the Committee's work would hamper delegations' ability to consider matters on their budgetary and administrative merits alone. The States members of the European Union would vote against the oral amendment.

19. **Ms. Baumann** (Switzerland), speaking also on behalf of Liechtenstein, said that the two delegations would vote against the proposed oral amendment. The role of the Committee was to decide on administrative and budgetary questions and ensure that the Organization had the resources necessary to fulfil mandates, rather than to discuss the mandates themselves. It was regrettable that the Committee, where decisions were normally taken by consensus, should be obliged to vote on the proposed oral amendment.

20. **Mr. Tommo Monthe** (Cameroon) said that the proposed oral amendment did in fact concern an administrative and budgetary question, since it was intended to prevent wastage, which was the Committee's role. The proposed wording made no mention of matters of substance, and the Group of African States was entirely within its rights to say that the amounts requested were a waste of resources. It was not the Group that had requested the vote and broken the consensus. Although the practice of the Committee was to seek consensus on the matters before it, voting was not forbidden under resolution 41/213. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposed oral amendment.

21. *At the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by Burkina Faso on behalf of the Group of African States.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Namibia, Nauru, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa,

San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam.

Abstaining:

Barbados, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Liberia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago.

22. *The oral amendment was rejected by 82 votes to 65, with 16 abstentions.*

23. **Mr. Tiare** (Burkina Faso), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said the delegations that had voted in favour of the proposed oral amendment had affirmed the guiding principles of the United Nations. Although his delegation respected the result of the vote, the approval of resources to allow the Independent Expert to conduct activities related to sexual orientation and gender identity, which had no international legal basis, was regrettable and would polarize the Member States, which had not reached consensus on the matter. The members of the Group dissociated themselves from those activities and reserved the right to ensure that their domestic legislation was respected.

24. **Mr. Wax** (Israel) proposed that, in section XV of draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.19, a new paragraph should be inserted, to read: "Decides not to approve any resources stemming from the adoption of resolution 31/36 by the Human Rights Council".

25. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

26. **Ms. Rodríguez Abascal** (Cuba) said that it was inappropriate to seek to undermine the allocation of resources for the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 31/36. The database of companies involved in the activities mentioned in the Secretary-General's report on revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-first, thirty-second and thirty-third sessions and twenty-fourth special session (A/71/623) should be established and updated, and the data therein should be transmitted to the Council in the form of a report at its thirty-fourth session. Her delegation would vote against the oral amendment proposed by Israel.

27. **Mr. Adam** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, said that the Group supported the request for a vote on the proposed oral amendment.

28. **Mr. Kantor** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Committee was responsible for administrative and budgetary matters rather than substantive issues related to decisions of other United Nations bodies. A vote on the revised estimates for the Human Rights Council would be unprecedented. The Council had adopted resolution 31/36 in accordance with its mandate and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Consensus-based decision-making was a long-standing working practice of the Committee, and it was regrettable that a specific resolution and Council mandate had been singled out. The proposed oral amendment was based on political rather than technical or budgetary considerations; the introduction of political elements into the Committee's work would hamper delegations' ability to consider matters on their budgetary and administrative merits alone. The States members of the European Union would vote against the proposed oral amendment.

29. **Ms. Baumann** (Switzerland), speaking also on behalf of Liechtenstein, said that the two delegations would vote against the proposed oral amendment, which exceeded the Committee's responsibility for administrative and budgetary questions and for ensuring that the Organization had the resources necessary to fulfil its mandates. It was regrettable that the Committee, where decisions were normally taken by consensus, should be obliged to vote on the proposed oral amendment.

30. **Ms. Medina** (Norway) said that her delegation would vote against the proposed oral amendment. The Committee's role was to decide on the administrative and budgetary questions of the Organization. The mandates adopted by the Human Rights Council should be funded and her delegation supported the draft resolution.

31. *At the request of the representative of Thailand on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, a recorded*

vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by Israel.

In favour:

Australia, Canada, Guatemala, Israel, Palau, United States of America.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras.

32. *The oral amendment was rejected by 151 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.*

33. **Mr. Sánchez Azcuy** (Cuba) said that no intergovernmental agreement on the definition of the responsibility to protect had been reached. In the Secretary-General's report on estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council under thematic cluster I: special and personal envoys and special advisers of the Secretary-General (A/71/365/Add.1), the resources requested for the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect could not be distinguished from those requested for the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide. In line with his Government's position of principle against genocide, his delegation fully supported the functions of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and the oral amendment it wished to propose was not intended to undermine that Office.

34. He proposed that two new preambular paragraphs and two new operative paragraphs should be inserted in section XIX of draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.19. The first new preambular paragraph would read, "Recalling that the General Assembly has not decided on the concept of responsibility to protect, its scope, implications and possible means of implementation"; the second new preambular paragraph would read, "Noting that the estimates of thematic cluster I comprise narratives, functions, expected accomplishments, indicators of achievements, outputs, and other information related to the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect". The first new operative paragraph would read, "Decides to delete the narratives, functions, expected accomplishments, indicators of achievements, outputs, and other information related to the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect, as contained in the strategic framework and the related narratives of the Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide"; the second new operative paragraph would read, "Requests the Secretary-General to issue a corrigendum to his report".

35. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

36. **Mr. Kantor** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Committee was responsible for administrative and budgetary matters rather than political discussion related to other United Nations forums, and for adequately funding the Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide, whose mandate had been approved in Security Council resolution 1366 (2001). The proposed oral amendment would hamper the performance of that mandate by the Office in collaboration with other United Nations entities, particularly the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect. The States members of the European Union would vote against the proposed oral amendment.

37. **Ms. Karbakhsh Ravari** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the General Assembly had reached no consensual agreement on the concept of the responsibility to protect or its scope, implications and possible means of implementation, and her delegation therefore supported the proposed oral amendment.

38. **Mr. Escoto González** (Nicaragua) said that the definition of the concept of responsibility to protect must be based on clear recognition of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. Since 2012, the resources for the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect had been requested in the context of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide. The budget estimates and related narrative for the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect should be removed from the budget document until the General Assembly took decisions on the concept, its implementation and scope, and other related matters. His delegation would support the proposed oral amendment and invited others to do likewise.

39. **Mr. Awad** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the principle of responsibility to protect was one of the most controversial questions among Member States, which had not agreed on a definition of the concept or its scope, impact and means of implementation since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 63/308. The application of the concept was a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, and his delegation would therefore vote in favour of the proposed oral amendment.

40. *At the request of the representative of Slovakia, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by Cuba.*

In favour:

Angola, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Equatorial

Guinea, Ethiopia, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania.

41. *The oral amendment was rejected by 82 votes to 25, with 46 abstentions.*

42. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.19, as orally amended, was adopted.*

43. **Mr. Wax** (Israel) said that his delegation objected to the approval of funding for Human Rights Council resolution 31/36, an unprecedented measure against the State of Israel that far exceeded the mandates of the Human Rights Council and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Despite those reservations, his delegation had decided not to challenge section XV of draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.19 as a whole because of his Government's belief that the international community must protect the human rights of all, including lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people, of whom Israel, as a member of the LGBT Core Group, was a leading supporter. Israel was at the forefront of the struggle to end violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, but dissociated itself from the approval of resources for the implementation of Human Rights Council 31/36. Those resources were being used to target the State of Israel and could be used to target any Member State in the future. It was time to stop funding activities intended purely to politicize the Human Rights Council.

44. **Mr. Khalizov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the oral amendment proposed by Cuba to section XIX of draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.19. It was unacceptable for the responsibility to protect to be included in the mandate of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide. That position had been established without preliminary consultations with Member States, which had not approved the mandate. The concept of the responsibility to protect had not been approved by the governing bodies of the United Nations and was not a legitimate political mandate of the Organization. It was regrettable that the concerns expressed over many years by a number of delegations were not reflected in the draft resolution.

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/71/L.20)

45. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft resolutions contained in chapter IV of the draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/71/L.20).

Draft resolution I: Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017

46. **The Chair** recalled that draft resolution I had been adopted earlier in the meeting.

Draft resolution II: Programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017

47. **The Chair** drew attention to draft resolution II, which dealt with revised budget appropriations for the biennium 2016-2017 (section A), revised income estimates for the biennium 2016-2017 (section B) and financing of the appropriations for the year 2017 (section C).

48. *Draft resolution II was adopted.*

Agenda item 133: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2018-2019 (*continued*) (A/C.5/71/L.17)

Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.17: Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2018-2019

49. *Draft resolution A/C.5/71/L.17 was adopted.*

Questions deferred for future consideration (A/C.5/71/L.21)

Draft decision A/C.5/71/L.21: Questions deferred for future consideration

50. *Draft decision A/C.5/71/L.21 was adopted.*

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the main part of the seventy-first session of the General Assembly

51. **Ms. Wairatpanij** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Committee

had completed its work at the current part of the seventy-first session through diligent, flexible and constructive engagement, despite the quantity and complexity of the issues before it. It had allocated resources to the regional commissions and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, in accordance with the mandate issued by the General Assembly in resolution 70/247. The draft resolution on human resources management was the first such resolution approved in four years and would guide the work of the Secretary-General designate in the areas of equitable geographical representation of developing countries among United Nations staff, gender equality, recruitment and the rejuvenation of the Organization. The figure of $5.395 billion taken as a basis for the proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2018-2019 was a preliminary estimate; the Secretary-General's proposals should reflect resource levels commensurate with mandates for their full, efficient and effective implementation. The Committee had also made good progress in relation to construction and business transformation initiatives.

52. **Mr. Abdallah** (Chad), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the Group welcomed the adoption of the draft resolutions related to human resources management, the provision of support to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda through the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017, the special political missions, the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire, the construction and renovation of facilities at the Economic Commission for Africa and the review of the United Nations Office to the African Union. The delays in the issuance of documentation, however, together with certain approaches to negotiation, had adversely affected the Committee's deliberations.

53. **Mr. De Preter** (Observer for the European Union) said that the European Union welcomed the provision of adequate financing to the special political missions, which had complex mandates and were essential to peace and security, human rights and the rule of law. The implementation of resolution 70/299, in particular the enhancement of the effectiveness and accountability of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, must be reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019 so that the Secretariat could help Member States implement the 2030 Agenda. A decision by the Committee on the financing of the resident coordinator system was long overdue. His delegation was disappointed that consideration of the Secretary-General's proposal to improve the regional structure of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had been deferred to the seventy-second session, despite the strong support for the Office in the General Assembly. He was concerned about the growing trend for delegations to raise questions regarding the financing of mandates approved by the Human Rights Council. As the administrative and budgetary body of the Assembly, the Committee was not the forum for the discussion of substantive issues related to decisions of other United Nations bodies.

54. The proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2018-2019 would enable the Secretary-General designate to fulfil mandates while maintaining budget discipline, enhancing flexibility and the capacity to set new priorities in light of emerging needs, and providing financial predictability throughout the biennium. The draft resolution on human resources management would allow harmonization and modernization through better performance management, mandatory mobility and the deployment of field staff to meet the needs of the Organization. The draft resolution on the global service delivery model would ensure that the Secretariat was truly global and could perform its mandates. It was regrettable that, during the negotiations on the pattern of conferences, consensus had not been reached on the proposals of the States members of the European Union to enhance the Committee's working methods, particularly given the challenges posed by meeting at the second part of the resumed session in May. The Secretariat, in particular author departments, and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions must address the chronic problem of late issuance of documentation to ensure that the Committee had time to consider the matters before it.

55. **Ms. Coleman** (United States of America) said that despite the late issuance of documents the Committee had worked collaboratively to reach consensus on most of the matters before it, seize the opportunity presented by the arrival of the Secretary-

General designate, build on the reforms launched by the current Secretary-General, and make the United Nations more effective, sustainable, relevant and able to serve the people of the world. The proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2018-2019 fully reflected the resources required and emphasized Member States' commitment to budget discipline. Gone were the days of double-digit percentage increases; for the third consecutive biennium, the proposed outline was flat, a signal to the Secretary-General designate that Member States expected the Organization to reprioritize, eliminate redundancies and improve efficiency to accommodate new mandates. The long-awaited benefits of Umoja, in which States had made significant investments, were reflected in the 2018-2019 budget outline, and the decision on the global service delivery model would allow the United Nations to consolidate services in a cost-effective manner. Further consideration should be given to the implementation of the model, which was the logical and financially responsible means of building on the changes made through Umoja and would, together with flexible workplace arrangements, greatly improve the cost-effectiveness of the Organization.

56. The draft resolution on human resources management would bring together a number of fragmented reform initiatives in a comprehensive framework, to be presented at the seventy-third session, that would allow the Organization to put people first and align human capital with mandate requirements. Following a year of inconclusive deliberations, the Committee's decision on supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda would allow the United Nations to focus on abandoning silos, realigning its functions and assigning new priorities in resource allocation, while helping Member States achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. The United Nations must focus its efforts on the field to ensure that it benefited those most in need; at the current part of the session, the Committee had taken decisions on over 30 special political missions, including those in Afghanistan, Côte d'Ivoire, Iraq, Libya and Syria.

57. **Mr. Minami** (Japan) said that the problem of late submission of documents was not entirely beyond the control of Member States, which were responsible for managing the Committee and should improve the negotiating environment by reviewing the Committee's working methods, with the possible establishment of a deadline for the submission of the Secretary-General's reports.

58. **Mr. García Landa** (Mexico) said that the funding approved by the Committee would allow the United Nations Mission in Colombia to perform its mandate as the international component of the tripartite Monitoring and Verification Mechanism established under the Agreement on the Bilateral and Definitive Ceasefire and the Cessation of Hostilities and the Laying Down of Arms. The deferral of certain matters before the Committee could polarize positions and hinder rational financial and administrative decision-making. Consensual solutions were highly valued in the Committee, and dialogue and consultation were essential to the sustainability of the Organization. The false division of delegations into two camps increased polarization, to the detriment of consensus and intermediate solutions achieved on the basis of transparency and good faith.

59. **Mr. Guo** Xuejun (China) said that, by reaching consensus on many issues, Member States had shown their commitment to partnership, mutually beneficial solutions and the strengthening of the United Nations and its internal administration. They had agreed to support implementation of the 2030 Agenda and had reached consensus on such business transformation initiatives as flexible workspace, Umoja and the global service delivery model, and on the strategic heritage plan at the United Nations Office at Geneva and construction at the Economic Commission for Africa and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. By approving the budget of the United Nations Mission in Colombia, they had given the Organization the resources to help that country achieve peace, stability and prosperity.

60. **Ms. Lee** Eun Joo (Republic of Korea) said that the Committee had given the Organization the tools to fulfil its mandates and guide the Secretary-General designate and his team.

61. **Mr. Morales López** (Colombia) said that the resources approved for the United Nations Mission in Colombia were essential to the implementation of its mandate and a decisive step towards lasting peace in the region. He thanked delegations for their support for peacebuilding in his country.

62. **Mr. Vachon** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that the decisions taken by the Committee would support the implementation of mandates in peace and security, development and human rights. The 2030 Agenda embraced all those areas, and the Committee best served the interests of Member States and the peoples for whom the United Nations had been founded when its decisions reflected the scope of such landmark agreements. The delegations welcomed the approval of resources for the United Nations Mission in Colombia, the consensus on United Nations support for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the approval of the necessary resources for the Human Rights Council. The Committee should help make the Organization more global in scope and structure. The delegations welcomed the approval of additional resources for the global service delivery model, under which efficiency would improve and administrative functions should be relocated from expensive cities to low-cost countries. United Nations funds, programmes and agencies and many developing countries had benefited from such initiatives in the preceding decade, but much remained to be done to bring the Organization closer to the people who needed its help.

63. **Mr. Khalizov** (Russian Federation) said that although the Committee had adopted draft resolutions on most of the matters before it by consensus, the majority of documents had been submitted towards the end of the time allocated in the programme of work. As a result, the Committee had lost over two weeks of working time during the session and had not been able to give due consideration to the complex matters before it. Close attention should be paid to ensure that such a situation did not reoccur. Since problems related to Umoja had in some cases contributed to late submission of reports, his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution reflecting Member States' concerns about the project.

64. **The Chair** declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work at the main part of the seventy-first session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.